History, Nationalism, and the Written Language of Early Rus'

Author(s): Horace G. Lunt

Source: *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Spring, 1990, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Spring, 1990), pp. 1-29

Published by: American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/309309

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavic and East European Journal*

This content downloaded from 192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

ARTICLES

HISTORY, NATIONALISM, AND THE WRITTEN LANGUAGE OF EARLY RUS'

Horace G. Lunt, Harvard University

Books, as a rule, reflect in important ways the common assumptions of the milieu in which they were written. Soviet books are inevitably influenced by the atmosphere of the last few decades. In 1990 it is no longer possible to pretend to evaluate Soviet scholarly works unless we include some attention not only to the known ideological requirements but in particular to the tacit presuppositions that underlie the overt premises and theses utilized in specific investigations. Foremost among them is a complacent Russocentric point of view that sees anything Russian as automatically superior. A major consequence is the fundamental axiom that a Russian ethnos, vaguely associated with a wider Slavic social and kinship unity, existed in the shadowy centuries long before the Slavs burst onto the historical scene by crossing the Danube early in the 500s. Essentially this unexamined principle rests on the eighteenth-century view that *because* the new Russian Empire is mighty and is possessed of a vital and burgeoning culture, Russians *must always have been* powerful and cultured. Though its roots go back to sixteenth-century chronicles, the twentieth-century versions of this Russian nationalist axiom come largely from V. N. Tatiščev's *История российская*, first published in 1768.[1] A corollary was the unexamined belief that the familiar seventeenth–eighteenth century model of legal and social relationships based on writing must also have been valid in the ninth and tenth centuries. *Of course* the princes who ruled Rus' before Volodimir *required* written accounts, it was assumed, and therefore they *had* a chancellery with archives. *Because* the Rus' were widespread, powerful, and cultured at least by 900, the argument runs, they *must have* made considerable use of Old

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Church Slavonic well before 988, since it is well known that OCS had been created in the 860s and therefore was surely available to Kiev both from the Moravian and Czech lands and from Bulgaria. This being so, the schools founded, according to the Primary Chronicle (*Повесть временных лет, PVL*), by Volodimir *must have* initiated formal education in OCS.

The empirical fact that no evidence of official or even widespread use of Cyrillic literacy clearly belongs much before 1056, when the Ostromir Gospel was written, is explained away by the vagaries of history—the loss of all early texts is accidental. It is more probable that the first beginnings of princely correspondence came no earlier than the reign of Jaroslav (1019–54); it is not mere historical accident that we have no practical documents from the eleventh century, and there is no reason to assume widespread use of the Slavonic rite and its OCS texts before about 1037.[2]

This broad historical scenario was already taken for granted when serious study of the history of the East Slavic languages—and for practical purposes this means chiefly the history of Great Russian and the language of the Russian Empire—began early in the nineteenth century. It was wedded to a second axiom, that the imported Old Church Slavonic, a *South* Slavic language, was a very different linguistic system from the early *East* Slavic of Rus′; though the two were closely related genetically, they came from different *groups*. On the basis of this point of view, many texts and analyses were published, although the heavy hand of censors from the Holy Synod impeded work on some early East Slavic texts, such as the *Izbornik* of 1073. Between 1880 and 1914 the field flourished, a cadre of well-trained young scholars was hard at work on editions and detailed studies.

The war and revolution slowed and finally stopped this activity.[3] Militant atheist Party officials made it dangerous even to study old manuscripts,[4] and Stalin's sponsorship of N. Ja. Marr's linguistic dogmas brought traditional linguistics to a halt.[5] At the same time, Stalin's enthusiastic advocacy of Russian nationalism helped to restrict free exploration of cultural history and actively reinforced the whole mythology of Russian superiority from the remotest antiquity to our own day.[6] The 1941–45 war further identified Soviet nationalism with the cult of Russia, despite a continued official doctrine of the equality of nations within the USSR. The promise of the young generation of linguists trained before 1920 came to fruition only in the work of a few émigrés (in particular N. S. Trubetzkoy and Roman Jakobson) and a handful of lucky individuals who survived the terrors of the 1930s and 1940s (*e.g.*, R. A. Avanesov, V. V. Vinogradov).[7] During and immediately after the war some summary works about the history of Russian were published, but they suffered greatly from prescribed hyperpatriotic doctrines and offered nothing important in data or approach.

Stalin's repudiation of Marr and his personal "discovery" of comparative and historical linguistics (1950) made it possible for the survivors to start

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

teaching and publishing once more, but on the whole the students trained between 1930 and 1950 were lost to the fields of linguistics and medieval culture. Students born in the 1930s could benefit from the few competent survivors, but too many of the professors still in charge of curricula and publications had not earned their position on scholarly merits. During the fifties a few gifted and favored students were allowed brief study sojourns in the West and a somewhat larger group visited international conferences, but the contacts were insufficient to make up for the lost decades.[8] The work of non-Soviet scholars remained generally inaccessible, and indeed it was politically dangerous even to admit knowledge of some (whether émigrés like Jakobson or victims of the Soviet regime like N. N. Durnovo, who reportedly was arrested on grounds of Belorussian nationalism).[9] Publication of important books such as Vaillant's *Manuel* helped somewhat, but the general intellectual atmosphere was not conducive to bold new initiatives.[10]

How hard it is to repair the damage can be seen from Vinogradov's careful introduction to Jakubinskij's 1941 *История древнерусского языка.* Although it is not clear why this confused book had to be published in 1952, Vinogradov's critique adroitly mixes praise of Stalin's linguistic "insights" with scorn for Marrist teachings and judicious warnings about some of Jakubinskij's ideas and statements. He sternly concludes that the book "lacks a firm methodological base" and that the reader must approach it with a "rigorously critical attitude both to the general historical-linguistic conception of the author and to certain of his positions" (40).[11] Along the way he skillfully skewers a number of prominent scholars for accepting some of the nonsense engendered by Marrists, including linguists like S. P. Obnorskij, P. Ja. Černyx, and A. S. L'vov as well as the literary historian D. S. Lixačev and the archeologist B. A. Rybakov.[12] Some of Vinogradov's concrete objections to Jakubinskij are spelled out in detail and some are merely sketched. The problem, however, is that students—and scholars—tend to consult the book with regard to specific questions and they forget to check the introduction. In effect, readers are vaguely reassured by the very fact that an authority like Vinogradov seems to give his blessing, and therefore they may well accept precisely the details Vinogradov objected to. If a statement is to be found in Jakubinskij, Obnorskij, and Černyx, then it acquires value as a "fact"—regardless of warnings to be found elsewhere. A whole universe of doctrines about the Slavs, the Russians, the history of Slavic literacy and the growth of East Slavic principalities is repeated, with only small quibbles about very minor details, over and over in footnotes and articles, textbooks, and encyclopedias. Repetition of the same theses everywhere leads to the illusion that this represents informed opinion. As a result, even the most critical and alert student acquires a host of little prejudices that bar the way to looking at old materials in new ways.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Publication of early texts and serious study of the history of the East Slavic languages resumed cautiously after 1960. It was immediately apparent that the level of knowledge about linguistic and philological method, along with elementary requirements about attention to detail and consideration of earlier scholarship, had gone down far below the standards of the 1920s. Sloppy work, further marred by errors of fact and inconsistent theoretical procedures, seems to have become normal procedure. Rigorous scholarship is the exception rather than the rule.[13]

It is necessary to say that the current generation of mature scholars who are now assuming positions of authority are hampered by poor training, in part because of reliance on books like Jakubinskij, and in part from indifferent and insecure teachers who owed their positions more to their profession of ideology than their merits as competent, much less original, scholars. Instead of independent-minded search for new answers based on new data or new approaches to known evidence, we find dreary rehashes of old and safe opinions; instead of sharp but principled questions about traditional solutions, we see passive and often sycophantic assent to statements already in print in approved publications. The mass of literature presents *received* opinion, but alas it is not *informed* opinion. Principled criticism is far too rare, and it usually comes from outside the Soviet Union.[14] Soviet Slavists have been lax both with критика and with самокритика.[15]

Decades of lip-service to the official thesis that Ukrainian and Belorussian have been independent languages since 1700 have not erased from the routine practice of Russian linguistic writing the fundamental position that can only be characterized as an imperial (Great-)Russian cultural bias.[16] Currently, there seem to be two major groups (at least in Moscow and Leningrad). The radical patriots—indeed chauvinists—combine their assumptions of Russian superiority with a conscious and active xenophobic rejection of non-Soviet scholarship; many occupy positions of power in both the Communist Party and academic life. An example is the late Fedot P. Filin (formerly an enthusiastic Marrist), whose many post–1950 books and articles were of little value but still must be quoted frequently (*e.g.*, Kolesov and Žukovskaja, *passim*), if only as a matter of form. A surely larger and far less homogeneous group is made up of people who have never noticed that their everyday assumptions include the thesis that Russian culture is and has always been superior. Such individuals may indeed be the victims of attacks from the ranks of the hyperpatriots because they quote non-Russian authorities or venture to approve of data assembled by foreigners. In their own minds they are liberal and tolerant; they simply do not realize that some of their matter-of-fact statements are offensive to Ukrainians or Belorussians because they are based on the imperial premise.[17] Either group is surprised when, for example, Bulgarian and Yugoslav Slavists express distaste for the blanket term "славяно-русский" that in Russian scholarly

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

publications is routinely applied to OCS and later Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbian, and Croatian medieval manuscripts.

The perennial problem of early Russian culture is that the language of early East Slavic manuscripts, starting with the Ostromir Gospel of 1056–57, shows a linguistic dualism that has been interpreted by scholars as a very special subdivision of OCS, often called the "Russian recension of OCS (Old Bulgarian)." One popular theory has held that this "Old Russian literary language" is OCS that is in the process of russification. A more patriotic view maintained that in fact the East Slavs had their own native "literary language" (examples of which unfortunately have not survived for us to study), but the vernacular features were overwhelmed by the southern traits of the official church language. In 1973, B. A. Uspenskij suggested that the "linguistic situation" in early Rus' is a good example of *diglossia*: a special complex usage of two coexistent languages (*i.e.*, related but distinct linguistic systems) with codified spheres of usage. "Slavonic" represents the superior realm of religion and intellectual discourse, while "Russian" serves for more familiar matters, including legal and administrative affairs. The appropriateness of the diglossia model for early Rus' was challenged—cogently and correctly, in my opinion—by Dean Worth in 1978, but it was embraced enthusiastically by Alexander Issatschenko and Gerta Hüttl (-Worth)-Folter, among others. Uspenskij went on to make a far more detailed sketch of diglossia among the East Slavs in a 1983 proposal, and he states it at even greater length in the 1987 textbook.

Surely we can take it as axiomatic that language and culture change with time; we do not expect the materials of the twelfth century to be the same as those of the fifteenth. Yet this axiom is frequently ignored in Soviet scholarship: anachronism is the rule in recent works about the history of Russian. "Old Russian" includes everything before 1700—the vocabulary, the syntax, the genres, even the social situations of Rus' in the eleventh–twelfth centuries and the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries are all in a single bin; bits from any century can be used to explain phenomena from every other century.[18]

Uspenskij's *История* and the Žukovskaja and Kolesov volumes, which are in part a response to it, share the historiographical myths of an early and superior "Russian" culture (including belief in extensive translation activity in early Rus')[19] and, on the whole, the Russocentric and anachronistic views sketched above.[20] They also share a discouraging lack of solid knowledge of OCS and early East Slavic grammar; the discussions do not seem to rest on a firm grounding in Slavic linguistics. A fair critique is extraordinarily space-consuming, since it requires first setting forth what an author has said and then showing how and why one disagrees.[21] Here I can only say that Uspenskij shares many of the general misunderstandings of these materials that are to be found in most Soviet books, and that many of

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

the interpretations he offers are not acceptable. Some details can only be hinted at here; fuller treatment of a couple of significant points is given in the appendix.[22] It is more important to look at the general approach Uspenskij takes to his subject matter.

An ideal account of the history of Russian should, I suggest, cover both spoken and written linguistic manifestations.[23] This implies two linguistic tasks: (1) the history of the various individual regional dialects and varieties of speech that are labelled with the name "Russian," and (2) the history of the variety or varieties of this language used in writing, especially (a) for practical purposes (personal, legal, commercial) and (b) for more spiritual purposes (religion, poetry, belles-lettres). For both tasks, one should deal with the phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon, plus, in the second task, how all this is expressed in writing. Moreover, there should be a discussion of the social framework, that is to say, the cultural history of the communities that used all these varieties of "Russian" in time and space. To expect all this in a textbook is obviously unrealistic, but the ideal provides a framework for discussion.[24] What does Uspenskij aim to teach in his История?

Uspenskij's opening section (1–13) "Предмет истории литературного языка" gives a great many definitions and statements of principle. First, we are told, we must distinguish the history of the literary language (which, methodologically, means the history of language in a strictly linguistic sense) from the history of the language of literature, which, Uspenskij asserts, turns out to be (*оказывается*) in essence the history of *texts*, that is, "a discipline intermediate between literary scholarship (*литературоведение*) and linguistics, and not a really linguistic discipline, as it ought to be" (1). At this point one expects to be told that in fact it is not the history of texts, but the history *of the language of texts*, that should be our object of study. Uspenskij does not make this statement, and the book shows that in many crucial situations he simply does not distinguish language from text. Rather, he declares that the history of the literary language is the history of norms, while the history of the language of literature is the history of *deviations from norms*. The historian of the literary language is, Uspenskij declares, interested in standard items, the background for creative activity; the historian of literature is concerned with the creative individuality of a writer, in part as expressed in language. This does not work. Norms can be determined only by studying the entire material to determine what is routine and what sort of deviations and exceptions occur, and the extent to which they are tolerated. Students both of language and of literature must ineluctably be concerned with both norm and deviation, although of course the emphasis in a given study may be focussed more on one or the other.

Uspenskij's ruminations about how to define *literature, literary language, system, norm, linguistic norm, book norm* (*книжная норма*), *natural* versus

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

artificial norms, and a series of other abstractions occupy several pages, until finally he declares (9) that the history of a literary language is directly bound up with the history of attitudes to language, and therefore various works *about* language are an important source. Now, of course speakers and writers do have attitudes about how one ought to speak and write. It is a radical leap, however, from this truism to the belief that prescriptive grammarians have much to do with what speakers and writers actually say and write. Indeed, the Russian language offers a succinct opinion: ерунда ('nonsense') expresses students' collective evaluation of such grammatical terms as *gerund.*[25]

Uspenskij, then, wishes to give us a history of attitudes about language. Unfortunately there are no works on grammar during the first centuries. Uspenskij, undaunted, simply quotes seventeenth-century grammarians to explain the whole seven-century period his book is supposed to treat. He defines the linguistic situation from c1000 as diglossic, affirming that *two* languages were used with complementary social functions. His elaborate discussion of the use of "Russian" and "Church Slavonic" is entirely theoretical (pp. 16–22); in essence he simply declares that a series of features *were* typical for "Russian" and others for "ChSl" and that this dualism can be neither bilingualism nor a contrast between a "literary language" and local dialects, but *has to be* diglossia. Soviet objections to Uspenskij's concept fail to challenge the fundamental assumption of linguistic dualism.[26]

A major fault of Uspenskij's whole book is its lack of attention to real data.[27] I find that the rather haphazard examples nearly all have quite different explanations from what Uspenskij proposes. In my opinion his elaborate diglossia, with its intricate multiplicity of structures, is a pipe-dream from an ivory tower—very far indeed from the world of real languages used in real societies.[28] The proto-typical cases of diglossia are Arabic, where the ninth-century language of the Quran maintains its prestige though regional dialects have diverged radically, and Greek, where various compromises between Classical and New Testament Greek were until very recently the prescribed modes of written expression. In eleventh-century Rus' there is no reason to look for a long and sacrosanct religious and linguistic tradition or for the regional linguistic diversity we may expect as a result of seven or eight centuries of farflung settlement patterns of the speakers of a once-homogeneous set of dialects.

The evidence from all Slavic sources (plus non-Slavic written sources and sober evaluation of archeological findings) fits nicely with the hypothesis that the written language of Rus' up to about 1200 shows the sort of partially coded variation that is typical of relatively new written languages, a good Slavic example being Macedonian, whose codification did not begin until 1944.[29] In the market-places, speakers of strikingly different community dialects use a "supradialect" that suppresses certain of the salient dif-

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

ferences and thus represents a kind of conventionally neutral means of communication.[30]

The intellectual problem in envisioning the situation in eleventh-century Rus′ is to suppress all associations with entrenched terms like *Russian, Bulgarian, East* Slavic, *South* Slavic—associations that call to mind *differences*. When we pay attention to the *samenesses*, the whole picture changes. OCS is a southeastern written compromise standard language of the 900s–1000s that conventionally selects and suppresses specific dialect features that might have been characteristic of particular localities in what is now Macedonia and Bulgaria. Forgetting the labels, we must look only at the linguistic facts that we can glean from the manuscripts. Similarly, we must look at the manuscript evidence from Rus′ up to about 1200, again suppressing knowledge of labels like *drevnerusskij*.[31] I submit that equal attention to similarities and dissimilarities, to samenesses and differences, demonstrates that the differences, striking though they are, are in fact of minor importance: "Old Russian" and OCS are mere variants of one language.[32] Individual variable elements are available as stylistic devices, helping writers achieve a modest gradation from elaborate or high style to simple or plain style,[33] but there is no systematic array of contrasting elements of a type that warrants seeing here the sort of dualism that lies behind diglossia or bilingualism.[34] Current practice, including such non-Soviet authors as Hüttl-Folter and Issatschenko, sees *either* Slavonic *or* Rusian as the dominant key of a given work or passage, and requires comment on elements that do not belong to that key.[35] The vast majority of texts are, I hold, *neutral*; a restricted list of elements may be deemed to have a "high-style" or "elevated" marking, and others may be "intimate" or "vulgar" (or some similar terminology).[36]

A competent textbook must make the subject matter clear, and definitions need to be specific. Students, if they are to make any sense out of the historical data, must be provided with at least crude outlines of dialect groupings that correspond to the changing conditions of different epochs. Leaving aside problems of distinguishing "Russian" from "Varangian" or "Polanian" or "Ukrainian," we need somehow to distinguish different epochs. At the outset, that is c1050 (for, *pace* Uspenskij's routine iterations of standard patriotic Russian myths, there is no earlier data of any significance), the "drevnerusskij jazyk" (or, to use an English neologism "Rusian") has distinctive features setting it off from West Slavic (*e.g.*, Polish, Czecho-Slovak) and South Slavic (Slovene, Serbo-Croatian; Macedonian, Bulgarian), but at the same time other features bind it to North Slavic (with West Sl., against South Sl.) and others to a larger Eastern group (with Macedono-Bulgarian, *i.e.*, Southeast SSl; against SW SSl plus WSl). With the passage of time and the development of various local societies, new groupings become significant: first southwest Rusian (eventually Ukrainian) versus

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

northeast (eventually Belorussian and [Great] Russian), then "zapadnorusskij" (U and BR) versus Russian. Uspenskij apparently assumes that his students know all this, though he never offers specific suggestions as to where they might find it.[37] On the other hand, it is not clear that he keeps these details in mind as he jumps from century to century, citing Kurbskij (16th c., or is it 17th?) cheek by jowl with the *Russkaja pravda* (12th c., p. 60), or in juxtaposing the near-synonyms говорю - глаголю (an early Slavic doublet) and щека - ланита (a late and specifically ESl dilemma) in the same breath (52).

Nothing can disprove the hypothesis that the written Rusian of c1100, for all its "South Slavic" elements and its codified variables, was not, in the overwhelming majority of its phonological, morphological, syntactical, and lexical elements, very close indeed to the dialects spoken by the scribes who copied the manuscripts that have survived and by the authors of the prototypes of texts like the *Povest' vremennyx let* whose linguistic form we can reconstruct in some (but not complete) detail from later copies. In short, this written Rusian of c1100 *was* "Old Russian"—*i.e.*, a single language—and not some dualistic complex that requires such names as "русская редакция древнеболгарского языка." However, in the course of the next few generations, rapid and fundamental linguistic change (concomitant with radical political and social changes) evolved into a very different situation, or rather series of situations. By about 1300 we must reckon with serious regional differences in local dialects that for present purposes can be called Ukrainian versus Muscovite and Novgorodian. The written language, in contrast to spoken dialects, remained fairly stable in accord with traditional written norms. This means that the gap between written and spoken language is widening, and the precise difference in distance between the two types of system is different in different regions. While for 1100 and perhaps even 1200 it makes no sense to speak of diglossia, perhaps by 1300 such a situation was developing. (Uspenskij sees the situation c1400 as having shifted from diglossia to bilingualism—again assuming far greater distance between the linguistic poles than seems plausible.) In the seventeenth century the dualism is obvious, and it exists in Muscovy against the vernacular background of Russian dialects and in the west against a more fluid Ukrainian-Belorussian continuum of dialects;[38] the rapid development of a new and western-oriented culture brought with it the need for radical linguistic change. The situation between 1400 and 1600 is extraordinarily complex, and careful study is needed of the many local varieties of written Slavonic and attempts to write something approaching vernacular—present-day knowledge is far too faulty to allow us to generalize at this time.

How are we to interpret the evidence of the earliest manuscripts? Uspenskij posits (1) two different languages, OCS and Rusian [to impose my term on his system], (2) a powerful tradition of church orthography and

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

pronunciation, and (3) a widespread knowledge of Greek.[39] By this thesis, OCS was a rigidly conventional standard with systematic rules for pronunciation and spelling (including morphology) that was acquired by 11th-century Rusian bookmen through rigorous schooling as a specific high-style code that differed in fundamental ways from local vernaculars; some vernacular features were admissible in writing for a low-style code suitable for certain specific genres.[40] Under the tutelage of a network of trained teachers, the scribes and bookmen of eleventh-century Rus' studied the Greek language (and particularly the important liturgical texts), and learned, with great effort, to pronounce and to write according to this OCS system that was in fundamental ways foreign to their native dialects. Artificial pronunciation dictated important spelling conventions, and artificial morphological and syntactic categories had to be mastered.[41] Indeed, the key to much of this was the Greek language from which the basic OCS texts had been translated—but translated so literally that often comprehension was possible only if one had at hand, or could envision, the original Greek.

I submit that none of the three assumptions is justified. First, the linguistic differences were trivial. Second, if we are to accept that the orthography rests on an artificial but obligatory church pronunciation and the morpho-syntactic structures used actively in original works reflect in the main the foreign—though closely related—South Slavic patterns, we need also the cultural premise that there was an educational system, presumably founded by South Slavs, that was strong enough to train the Rusian pupils in every spoken and written detail. I see no evidence whatsoever for this cultural premise. Third, although it seems probable that the church established by Volodimir in 988 was firmly in the hands of Greek clergymen, and that the Slavonic rite became official only about 1037, nothing at all supports the view that Slavs read and utilized Greek texts before 1100.[42]

To oversimplify, Uspenskij approaches a manuscript with the question, "What artificial rules enable the Rusian scribe to conceal his native linguistic habits?" while I urge that we first ask "What did the scribe write?" and then classify the data in terms of the scribe's system, and only thereafter compare this evidence with OCS and hypothetical vernacular East Slavic systems.

Uspenskij's powerful assumption allows anything to be interpreted as learned and non-vernacular, but on the whole I find it unwarranted and unnecessary. He writes (144); "Можно полагать, что такие категории, как имперфект и, вероятно, аорист, отсутствовали в рус. яз. уже в период первого юж-сл. влияния" [*i.e.*, before 1000]. Of course it is *possible* to make the assumption, but in view of the fact that our total knowledge of early and medieval Slavic, tested by comparative evidence from later dialects, indicates a common system not long before 800, it is both simpler and more plausible to believe that the older verbal forms survived in East Slavic just as they did in OCS (and much later South Slavic) and in the Czech that

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

is attested in the 1400s. Why does Uspenskij wish to push all linguistic innovation in Rus' back to the tenth century? For the system of simple preterites, supplemented by various periphrastic tenses, I agree with the many scholars (*e.g.*, Maslov) who find the use of this intricate formal system in original East Slavic works to be congruent with known living systems; I therefore accept it as part of the vernacular(s). Moreover, the texts show the progressive decay of the old complexity so that by 1500 we may indeed assume something like the modern East Slavic verbal categories and forms.

Let us sketch some theoretical bases for evaluating these propositions and procedures.

Writing is language divorced from two major factors of basic human communication: it lacks the acoustic signals of pitch, intensity, timing, and numerous other components of oral speech; and it lacks the living face-to-face framework of a real speech-event, including in particular the facial and body gestures that inevitably accompany speech and supplement—often in crucial ways—the communicative value of the spoken word. A written message is only a substitute for spoken communication; written language is ALWAYS to some degree artificial, and communication is possible only when sender-writers and receiver-readers agree on the use of certain conventions. The simplest case is a written code with an essentially one-to-one relationship between alphabetic units and basic phonological units—a type represented now by systems devised by linguists for recently non-literate groups in, say, New Guinea. In theory, a student needs only to learn the alphabet and a few writing conventions (such as space between words, simple punctuation) and is immediately able to write down any sentence he wishes to communicate. In fact, language is so variable even within closely related communities that further conventions are at once needed, especially if the written code is to serve a wider set of communities. This "simplest" situation is necessarily vulnerable to linguistic change over time, for the speech of the great-grandchildren of the inventors of the alphabet will almost certainly have changed at least in minor details. The changes may at once be incorporated into the writing. On the other hand, there may be practical reasons to hold on to old habits (for example, if a sound-change has happened in one part of the community but not in others). Or else the writing system has become endowed with social prestige and for students it becomes a matter of pride to learn an ever more artificial set of detailed conventions in order to read and write "properly." To repeat, writing is always somewhat artificial, and any standardized written system has to be learned as a separate task long after a child is fully fluent in speech.

Turning now to the beginning of Slavic written language, I conclude that the Moravian Mission resulted in an efficient alphabet and a considerable body of translated texts suitable for a Late Common Slavic dialect on this "simplest" basis. Between c885 and c1020 this body of texts was diffused

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

through the Bulgarian lands, and the writing conventions were modified in minor ways (with a major set of alternatives provided by the new "Cyrillic" alphabet) to suit regional needs, while new translated and original texts were created. OCS shows a great deal of variation that reflects both regional and historical differences, but for all that it has not departed very far from its beginning state in the essentials of phonology and grammar. With Jaroslav's endorsement of the Slavonic rite in the 1030s, I suggest, OCS books were imported and used as models.[43] These Slavobulgarian volumes constituted a small monastic library that initiated the Rus′ into a very restricted realm of Byzantine culture, almost exclusively bound up with Christian ritual and dogmatics. Uspenskij's account misrepresents the nature of Byzantine influence on the culture of Rus′ and underestimates the crucial intermediary role of the Bulgarian monastic establishment that determined, in large part, the selection of works that eventually arrived in Rus′.[44]

I take as a working hypothesis that the Rusian scribes, having learned the letters, their basic values and combinations, along with some conventions (*e.g.*, "every line must end in a vowel-letter"; "certain stems may be abbreviated"; "the first personal pronoun is азъ"; "third-person present verb-forms end in -ть") would be ready not only to copy model texts but to write independent compositions.[45] Examining first precisely what the scribes of the early generations wrote, one finds that they deviated from the norm of "ideal OCS" (constructed on the basis of OCS scribal usage plus comparative evidence from Slavic and non-Slavic dialects) in a series of definable ways. Many of the deviations easily can be interpreted as belonging systematically to a different, clearly Rusian, norm, and some may be attributed to the models being copied, leaving a small number to be viewed simply as scribal errors. The distinctive features of OCS that become obligatory for East Slavic writings are important but minimal, I submit, as is undeniable from the rapid development of identifiable Rusian norms, whereby manuscripts of 1056, 1073, 1076, and 1092 show a shift from almost pure OCS in 1073 to clearly Rusian conventions in 1076, further normalized in 1092 according to rules that remain, on the whole, valid for centuries.[46] On this basis I believe it possible to argue that until about 1100 the *jers* were full-fledged vocalic phonemes, that in subsequent decades somewhat different scribal usage shows a fairly rapid decay of this older system, with more and more idiosyncratic spellings of individual words and morphemes, so that by about 1200 new norms emerge. Uspenskij seems to agree with this time-table, but he apparently believes it to be a purely theoretical conjecture and not a series of stages that can be seen in the evidence. It is simpler to see *akanie* as a local development that took place approximately when it first appears in the manuscripts (c1340) than (*pace* Uspenskij, 137) to assume that it was prehistoric but remains unattested because of (a) the superior knowledge scribes had of spelling rules, or (b) the historical

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

accident that no earlier manuscripts written in the vast regions where akanie is known chanced to survive.

Uspenskij provides many interesting observations and he raises important problems, but on the whole his book fails to provide a plausible framework for the development of written standard Rusian/Russian from c1050 to c1700. Information on many morphological questions is skimpy, *e.g.*, no mention of a future tense, little about the declension of substantives,[47] and almost nothing about personal pronouns.[48] The discussion of preterite forms suffers not only from pervasive anachronistic confusion but from a misunderstanding of the relationship of language to text in chronicle passages that differ both because of chronology and because of textual emendations. On broader cultural matters I often must take issue with Uspenskij's imaginative views,[49] and at times his remarks are not merely implausible but surely incorrect.[50] Uspenskij's book, in my opinion, is of dubious value for students, though it may goad specialists to productive responses.

The articles in the volumes edited by Žukovskaja and Kolesov offer little that is useful or new, although they provide ample illustration of the weaknesses of Soviet scholarship I sketched above. Žukovskaja, "Грецизация," examines new evidence of the slow infiltration of South Slavic features in the 15th century, but since comprehensive knowledge of the development of the *details* of language from 1300–1500 is nowhere available, her remarks are devoid of precision and linguistic conclusions remain vague. These volumes do not clarify anything. Perhaps the most promising effort is Ustjugova's confrontation of *torot/trat* variations in different copies of the PVL. Taking the entry for 997 (which starts бысть *гладъ* великъ в *городе*, Lav, 'there was great hunger in the town', but голодъ . . . в градѣ Нур), she forthrightly admits, "Причины этого различия далеко не всегда поддаются анализу" (93–4). Such an honest admission of perplexity in the face of conflicting evidence is refreshing.[51]

My focus has been on the early period, up to about 1300; here I disagree with Uspenskij's fundamental view in three areas: (1) language—the initial period of Rus' culture falls within the linguistically Common Slavic period and OCS is but a variant of East Slavic; one language allows for no diglossia or bilingualism. (2) literacy—despite individual bits of data demonstrating that writing was known in the East Slavic regions from 900 on, there is no evidence for *organized and official* literacy before c1037; moreover there is no clear evidence for *administrative* literacy before 1100. (3) culture—11th-century Rusian written culture is a pale copy of OCS culture, with no traces of direct Greek input and virtually no signs of original creativity until the 1070s. As for later periods, space allows me only to note that I find his presentation of the "Second South Slavic Influence" too imitative of Issatschenko (and therefore of Talev, see my review of the latter) and—like most discussions—concerned more with graphic and stylistic matters than

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

with language, *i.e.*, phonology, morphology, and syntax. His "Third South Slavic Influence"—*viz.* Nikon's importing of Kievan church texts into Muscovy—is merely a terminological conceit for seventeenth-century developments that can be viewed in a number of different ways.

In spite of my generally negative comments and harsh judgments, my position has always been optimistic, for I have believed that Soviet Slavists, if allowed to ignore some of the dogmas of Marxism and nationalism, might begin to provide well organized and accurate bodies of data, meticulous and well-reasoned analyses of evidence, fresh reinterpretations of known materials. Indeed, the work of Zaliznjak on the new evidence from Novgorod is first-rate, and some recent work by younger scholars (*e.g.*, Živov, Nikolaev) help keep my hopes alive.[52] Although the panorama as I see it is bleak, change is possible. It requires, however, that the majority of well-placed teachers and scholars be willing seriously to examine their own assumptions and procedures, to debate among themselves about facts, opinions, and methods, and to look beyond the "schools" of Moscow and Leningrad to see what scholarship elsewhere has accomplished. The questions are broad and difficult and the tasks of answering them are enormous: Just when did the East Slavs begin to make their own translations from the Greek? How can we tell? What were the East Slavic dialects like c1300, c1400, c1500? What systems are revealed in the individual manuscripts at each stage? What innovations can be observed? What archaisms are normal components (and in what sort of texts)?

Appendix

A comparison of the complex array of aorist forms in western OCS to the slightly simpler inventory of eastern OCS and Rusian shows but the beginning of changes in form and inventory that are of vital importance for the development of divergent dialects and the genesis of new verb systems; the details have been poorly described, and therefore much that is significant remains obscure. Here are a couple of details.

The OCS 2–3 singular aorist ended in a non-jer vowel, except for the highly irregular forms бысть, дасть, and ѣсть (Lunt *Gram* §10.51) and a special group of a dozen roots that regularly have -ть in western OCS, though they often omit it in eastern OCS; among them are пить or пи 'drank', -вить -ви 'wound', жить жи beside живе 'lived', приѧть or прия 'received', and клѧть or кля 'swore'. In Rusian, the -ть of third person verbs in the present (and, optionally, imperfect) also appears in бысть, дасть, and ѣсть (beside бы and да, also attested in OCS). In Rusian copies of OCS models and also, though less frequently, in original ESl works, forms like пить and клѧть/клѧть (with -ъ) occur. It is probable that these are consciously used marks of high style; sometimes scribes automatically write -ть, but -ть is

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

more frequent.[53] The list of verbs that permit this ending is short and the same stems take the past passive participial suffix *-t-*.[54] The root *bi* 'strike' does NOT belong here: it takes the ppp suffix *-en-* and is never found with тъ in 2-3s aorist.[55] Thus испити forms испитъ or испи as 3s aor and испитъ 'having been drunk', while избити forms only изби and избиенъ 'having been killed'. If we find избитъ in a text, it is either the supine '(in order) to kill' or perhaps to be read as two units, aorist изби plus the pronoun тъ 'he, that one'. If neither fits the context, something is wrong with the text.

These facts are not recognized by Soviet Slavists. In the posthumous OCS grammar by Selišč̌ev, who surely knew the facts (as did Durnovo, Очерк §479), the list (II 171) includes битъ and клатъ along with би and кла; this doubtless comes from the careless editors and proof-readers for витъ/ви and клѧтъ/клѧ. Meščerskij took убитъ in Esther to be a normal Slavonicism; he did not notice that the verse, 9:16, is hopelessly corrupt (*cf.* Lunt and Taube, 171). Borkovskij and Kuznecov (271), in their widely used textbook, give битъ as their first example of this category, as does Xaburgaev in his OCS handbook (275). This sort of error in Soviet works can lead foreign scholars astray; Vlasto's sole example is the impossible "избитъ" (158).[56]

Even a book supposedly concentrating on the details of the verb in early texts claims that in the Ostromir Gospel an aorist "обрятъ" occurs (Avanesov, 76);[57] the form of course is the past active participle обрѣтъ, John 9:35, correctly identified by Vostokov in 1843. This irregular but frequent verb deserves study; in older texts there are no perfective forms with the sequence -рят- because the **ę* occurred only in the present stem **-rętj-*, whence OCS обрѧшт- and standard Rusian обрѧщ- (cf. Lunt *Gram* §16.55, Vaillant *Manuel* §214). Ivanov (Avanesov 77) cites обрѣшѧ from Ostr. as an old 3p "sigmatic aorist"—an inappropriate term to separate out variant Slavic aorists—while Vostokov in 1843 saw it as a scribal error for обрѣтошѧ. How can we choose between these proposals? Any scribe can make a mistake, and omission of a syllable is one of the commonest of slips made by early Slavic scribes. On the other hand, if we theorize that this verb had a third variant form, in addition to the root and regular aorists (обрѣтѫ, обрѣтошѧ), the linguistic logic of the formation of Slavic aorists dictates that stems ending in a dental obstruent take "s" and not "x" and predicts *обрѣсѧ. Vostokov is therefore surely right. Ivanov's implausible definition is not new in the Russian tradition, for it was made by Ščepkin in the appendix to the 1890 translation of Leskien's OCS *Handbuch* (186, 188). The idiosyncratic development of this bookish verb and its sibling *sъ-rętsъ-rętj-* (the ancestor of Russ встретить встречать and Ukr [зу]стріти/[зу]стрінути [зу]стрічати) should be traced in detail. Neither the modern обрету (implied in Sreznevskij's lemma) nor Vasmer's alleged old обряту is attested, as far as I know, before 1500.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Unexpected aorist forms that appear well after aorists seem to have disappeared from East Slavic vernaculars should also be examined. For example, даде is not old, but occurs after 1500,[58] beside older да or the ambiguous дасть; it may have been borrowed from South Slavic.[59] On the other hand, ляже 'lay down'—with the vowel of the present system (*cf.* лягу) rather than the infinitive-aorist (*cf.* лечи, леглъ and correct леже in old texts)—must have been invented by an East Slav. It survives into the Synodal Bible of 1751.

The search for such oddities must be guided by prudence and knowledge of what are normal old and new forms. Uspenskij (148) trustingly copies a putative pair of "hypercorrect aorists" from Issatschenko: "ясно, что формы *сѣ* вместо сѣдѣ [! HGL] и *бы* вместо *быша* образованы от *селъ* и *были*." First, the appropriate aorist is сѣде 'he seated himself' (here fig., 'assumed the throne') and not сѣдѣ 'he was sitting', *i.e.* a form of the perfective сѣсти, not the imperfective stative сѣдѣти; the corresponding l-participle would be сѣлъ (not *е*). Second, the sentence in the First Novgorod Chronicle *sub* 1225 has the flawless aorists сѣде and быша (Nasonov 64, 219). Why Issatschenko miscopied it is immaterial; it is incomprehensible that Uspenskij took over both the incorrect example and the unacceptable interpretation.

* * *

The plural forms of nouns in Russian (and Belorussian and Ukrainian) differ significantly from the OCS (= earliest Slavic) subsystems. While the starting points and the modern structures are well known, the time and place of various individual detailed changes and intermediate stages are obscure. In my experience, students are puzzled as they meet intermediate examples in texts, and they want guidance. Uspenskij says nothing at all about this important restructuring.

Let us look at only a fragment. The desinences of N and A pl in masculine nouns were formerly distinct; since c1500 they have been identical for non-animates, while A=G for animates:

	old	new	old	new
Np	вози	возы	бѣси	бѣсы
Ap	возы	возы	бѣсы	бѣсов
Gp	возъ	возов	бѣсъ	бѣсов
Np	тоци	токи	отроци	отроки
Ap	токы	токи	отрокы	отроков
Gp	токъ	токов	отрокъ	отроков

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Leaving aside numerous parallel questions ("soft-stems" like ножь and мужь; post–1500 desinence *-á* [бокá, весá], i-stems, u-stems), it is clear enough that (1) the A replaced the N (or rather the desinence /-i/ was replaced by /-y/, thereby removing the special consonant-mutations or palatalizations known or assumed for the old N-forms), and (2) the use of genitive form for accusative function in singular (N=A возъ, токъ but A=G бѣса, отрока) spread to the plural.[60] If the old situation still obtained c1050 and the new existed c1500, can we pin down just when and how the changes took place? Iordanidi puts it back to 1076 (193) but she has failed to look either at the examples in context or the definitions provided in the glossary to the edition: it is one more example of the inexcusable ignorance displayed by her article (and the irresponsibility of the editors who allowed it to be published). Durnovo 1924 §385 has an example from 1092 that can easily be explained in another way, while otherwise he cites a part of a 1219 sentence already adduced by Sobolevskij (1907) and then moves to evidence no earlier than 1250.[61] It seems safe to assume that for a time (how long?) the old and distinctive N coexisted with the new use of A; this could lead to instances where both возы and вози, бѣсы and бѣси might occur for either case-function. This in turn may cause textual difficulties.

An example is inadvertently cited by Vlasto (86), who prints "пересѣчены быша грекы" from the PVL *sub* 915 to show *-y* in both participle and noun instead of the N *-i* he expects. Now, "PVL" ordinarily means the Laurentian text of 1377 and guarantees a use for at least the 1370s and implies, if we are duly cautious, the possibility of something close to 1120. However, at this point Lav is defective and the passage is traditionally printed according to the Radziwill copy of c1490, a copy that (like its companion, Akad., of the same age) has undergone considerable linguistic up-dating and thus is far less reliable for reconstructing the hypothetical original grammar. Here in fact we find пересѣчени быша грекы: it makes a flawless sentence, "they were slaughtered by the Greeks," where пересѣчени is nominative and refers to the Bulgars of the previous clause ("the Bulgars clashed [in battle] with the Greeks") and грекы is a normal instrumental plural (a form valid as late as 1550). Moreover, it fits the context *unless one has outside information.* Such information is indeed available, first from the Hypatian copy of PVL, c1425 (and in spite of many flaws at least as important a witness to the old *text* of the PVL as Lav, see Ostrowski): посѣчени быша грѣци "the Greeks were slaughtered" and then from the knowledge that this passage is based on the Hamartolus Chronicle, whose extended report of the events leaves no doubt that the Bulgars won—though again the grammatical expression is passive, побѣждени быша греци.[62]

More interesting is a form not cited by Vlasto, the unquestionably N греки in this same passage from RA that is lacking in Lav (PSRL 1.42.15; Нур 32 грѣци); otherwise RA have N грьци/греци in agreement with Lav

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

грьци a dozen times, while the surely Bulgarian shape грекове appears in RA (Lav 166.3, note). In the common ancestry of R and A is clearly at least one editor with a taste for the newly modish Bulgarian orthography and an occasional morphological form, but N греки shows the influence of an East Slav. At the same time, we may postulate that the form грекы was intended as instrumental: of the three times Lav has Ip греки, R has греки once (47.15) but грекы twice (54.9, 73.20), to which we may add the spelling of PSRL 1.42.20. Since it is generally the custom of R's scribe to write -ки, we may safely see these three instances of -кы as a conscious effort to write a distinctive form: he *meant* instrumental, presenting the Greeks as victors in this battle.[63] It is this kind of philological detail that can be crucial in historical investigations, and it is the task of linguists to persuade students to learn the minutiae so that such problems can be debated seriously.

Methodologically, we must always read what the scribes wrote and see if it makes sense in terms of the immediate context. Vlasto skipped this crucial linguistic step—a kind of hastiness that is all too common in Slavic textology—and preferred extra-linguistic evidence. In this particular example neither linguistic nor historical conclusions are vitally changed, since we do have outside evidence. However, Vlasto's example has not helped answer the question of just when between c1250 and c1500 the old nominatives ceased to be normal spoken forms. In examining texts for pertinent evidence, we must be careful to exclude the work of southern scribes, for the merger of *i* and *y* in most Ukrainian dialects confuses the issues involving desinences in Russian and Belorussian dialects.

NOTES

1 Historians analyzing the background to events of 988 have illuminated the work of Tatiščev in many ways, and while one may allow that he might have possessed some sources that have perished since his time, on certain crucial points (and many details) he apparently gave free rein to his imagination. For example, the *Ioachim Chronicle*, which furnishes abundant accounts of otherwise unattested events of the tenth century, turns out to be thoroughly suspect, since Tatiščev produced no less than four different "original" versions, see Francis Thomson's comments and the literature he cites, "Contribution," (esp. 218–20, 226). Building on the foundation of Tatiščev's conceptions, subsequent scholars—from N. M. Karamzin through S. M. Solov'ev to V. O. Ključevskij, to mention only the most influential—further shaped and canonized the fundamentally nationalistic Russian view of history.

2 For more on the question of writing (and the *need* for writing) in Rus' before 1037, see Lunt 1988; see also Franklin 1985, 1987.

3 A chilling memoire by Samuil Borisovič Bernštejn, a distinguished Slavist with important publications in comparative Slavic and Bulgarian linguistics, offers a glimpse of the catastrophic political intervention that liquidated "one of the most important fields of scholarship in humanities in the course of one decade" (78). The field he defines as Slavic philology includes non-Russian and medieval linguistics and culture. (Bernštejn's essay reached

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

me only in time for last-minute revisions to this article; I have not attempted to integrate it fully into my discussion, but I strongly urge all Slavists to read it.)

4 According to Bernštejn's cautiously worded account (79), significant difficulties began as early as 1925, when Andrej Ja. Vyšinskij (later notorious as a public prosecutor in the show trials of 1937–38) was appointed *rektor* of Moscow University. He expressed displeasure because students were reading gospel passages in OCS classes!

5 Marr's influence was dominant in Leningrad as early as 1926; one of Vyšinskij's demands was that Marr's doctrines be taught in Moscow (Bernštejn, 79). Marr played in linguistics (and therefore also in philology) the role that Lysenko played in Soviet biology; for some details see Thomas and L'Hermitte and the literature they cite. It must be stressed that from the mid–thirties to 1950 public acceptance of Marr's theories was obligatory, while even mild objections entailed the risk of loss of employment or worse; Marrism was equated with Marxism and dissent was automatically anti-Soviet and therefore possibly criminal. Some scholars whose earlier work was valuable were forced to compromise and write Marrist analyses; others fell silent or simply disappeared. Scholars who had been branded "anti-Marrist" could be considered "politically unreliable" even after 1953. Marrists who were well placed in the Party, on the other hand, could "repent" and retain important academic positions.

6 Despite Stalin's overall Great-Russian bias, a decisive blow to Slavic studies, according to Bernštejn (79–80), was the arrest of leading Slavists at the end of 1933 under the pretext that the philologist and literary scholar M. N. Speranskij had organized a reactionary chauvinistic Russian royalist cabal with ties to "White Guard" émigrés, in particular Prince Nikolaj Trubetzkoy, professor of Slavic in Vienna. The emphasis of the accusation was shifted early in the process from Russian chauvinism to the allegation that Slavic philology was a reactionary *nauka*, so that its practitioners were *ipso facto* anti-Soviet. The official view was proclaimed at a scholarly meeting in December, 1934, by a cooperative *docent* (who apparently later disappeared into prison), cf. Bernštejn, 82. D. D. Dimitrov, in a typically distorted, jargon-laden denunciation of selected émigré Russian and Ukrainian Slavists, and of a couple of scholars born and educated outside of the Russian Empire, declared (27) that Slavic philology "была всегда наукой заведомо и насквозь пропитанной зоологическим национализмом"; therefore, of course, "она должна была врасти всем своим сущестсвом в систему современного фашизма," *etc., etc., cf.* Bernštejn, 82.

7 Bernštejn (80) reports that Vinogradov was one of the outstanding Slavists arrested in 1933–34, along with Speranskij, G. A. Il'inskij, A. M. Seliščev, V. F. Ržiga, and others.

8 This does not imply that all was well in Western Europe in the 1930–1950 era. Nazi ideology was felt in Germany, despite the courageous opposition of Max Vasmer and others, and the war brought work almost to a halt. The number of scholars working productively in the field of Slavic linguistics and early medieval texts was small.

9 Durnovo taught in Brno, Czechoslovakia, in 1926–27. Soon after returning to Moscow, he was sent to Minsk, where he published some articles in Belorussian and reportedly helped elaborate the new Belorussian standard language. The charge I cite above is the version of Durnovo's fate I heard in Prague in the 1940s. Bernštejn (80) is probably more accurate in stating that Durnovo was a key figure in the trumped-up "Speranskij affair," apparently because of his stay abroad and the fact that his son was married to one of Trubetzkoy's daughters. The history of this and similar episodes of the time remains to be elucidated.

10 The field of general linguistics fared better, with numerous Russian translations of key books and articles representing a broad spectrum of Western scholarly opinion. Scholars writing on specifically Russian or more generally Slavic topics were more likely to have to touch on substantive matters possibly involving ideological nuances and therefore subject to Party scrutiny.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

11 "Нельзя не признать, что некоторые из этих гипотез многим вполне зрелым учёным кажутся очень соблазнительными" (Vinogradov 1953, 10).

12 Vinogradov's objections to Jakubinskij remain valid despite the positive evaluation recently offered by Eckert.

13 One must make allowance for the abominable working conditions that most scholars have had to put up with, including the inaccessibility not only of foreign publications but often of standard Russian works (not to mention works by disapproved authors). This, however, in no way excuses the elementary errors of interpretation of OCS and early Russian words and sentences that are commonplace.

14 Recent examples are Marti and Hock. Hock's book (originally a master's essay) includes a list of about 1800 [!] errors in the standard edition of the important 12th-century Uspenskij Sbornik, most of them in the glossary. Sad to say, his list could be extended considerably.

15 Bernštejn concludes his devastating memoire with an expression of satisfaction that the damage wrought by malefic political authorities in the 1930s had been repaired as early as the 1958 International Congress of Slavists in Moscow. I demur; the Soviet contributions to that congress showed the strengths of the generations trained before 1930, but only offered hope that post-war students were being guided by competent teachers. Unfortunately, academic power was assumed not by the young generation, but by persons of middle age, who, like F. P. Filin (see below), were remarkable more for political adroitness than for scholarship. No one seems to have insisted on high scholarly standards. I submit that the bulk of the Soviet work published during the 1980s in Russian and Slavic historical linguistics and philology shows that there is still a long road to travel.

16 The opposite pole of nationalist dogma—Ukrainian separatism—has been dormant in the Soviet Union but has been vigorously expressed by some émigré scholars. In linguistics, anti-Russian sentiment engenders the claim that the Rus′ of Volodimir and his sons already spoke Ukrainian.

17 This is simply a variant of the imperialist frame of mind I found so normal during close association with Englishmen in 1943–45; I was made aware of it precisely because occasionally I was given to understand that as a colonial I did not participate in true English culture. At the same time it became apparent to me that I had an unconscious presumption of American superiority that was interpreted by various people as imperialistic arrogance. The prevalence of this kind of attitude in many nations does not make it a desirable trait, conducive to fair-minded and honest study of culture.

18 This disregard of history seriously compromises many of the fundamental propositions advocated by Uspenskij, and it vitiates major arguments in Alekseev. For some harmful effects on historical lexicology, see my reviews of the first volumes of the *Dictionary of the Russian Language of the XI–XVII Centuries.* More recent volumes, I regret to say, continue to be misleading about time and place of attestation; one illustration must stand for many.

SRJa's lemma исключити (v. 6, 256) should be deleted. The verb is not otherwise attested before 1700, according to Wm. Mahota's unpublished research. Исключить is surely a calque from Latin *excludere* and/or F. *exclure* and/or G. *ausschliessen.* SRJa's example is based on an excerpter's misreading of a printed нєключєнъ as исключеньъ. The adjective неключенъ 'worthless' is correctly defined by SRJa (11, 151), with an example from the same work, the *Aleksandrija.* The relationship with неключимъ, amply attested in OCS, is unclear, but they somehow go with OCS ключити сѧ. Non-reflexive ключити (SRJa 2, 201) and включити (3, 201) should also be discarded, for they are ghosts, from a faulty transmission of surely original OCS съключ-. (As for the *Aleksandrija*, its time and place of translation, and therefore its "Russianness," are open questions that need investigation.)

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

19 In this book, Uspenskij (29–39) is particularly insistent that eleventh-century bookmen were thoroughly literate in Greek, a view not supported by the evidence. He also accepts the myth of translations from Hebrew (and even Syriac). The myth was created almost single-handedly by N. A. Meščerskij; what is discouraging is that Meščerskij's linguistic and philological discussions of the Slavic texts, in particular the book of Esther, are so hopeless in terms of fact and methodology, that it is hard to understand why they were even taken seriously (*cf.* Lunt and Taube). Meščerskij's extravagant claims about East Slavic translations from Greek and Semitic have been assiduously propagated by his pupil, Alekseev, who eludes major problems simply by declaring at the outset that a given text *is* an "Old Russian translation." Thus, a paper whose focus is on the textual history of the Song of Songs in the Gennadius Bible of the 1490s (a paper useful for its evidence that the text is found in East Slavic manuscripts as early as the late 1300s) bears the prejudicial title "*К истории переводческой школы XII в.*". In fact Alekseev has failed to demonstrate that the text, and especially the long commentary in which it is embedded, is of East Slavic origin; the "translators' school" remains utterly speculative. His polemic technique is "stone-walling"; he ignores counterevidence and alternative proposals even though he cites articles with opposing views as though he has discussed the issues.

20 Thus Uspenskij, at the end of his introductory chapter (21), blandly posits a single major period, eleventh–seventeenth centuries, with subdivisions to separate the period of the "second South Slavic influence" (c1400–c1650), from the earlier—apparently monolithic—era and the latter part of the seventeenth century. He takes it for granted that "Russian" applies to *Rus′* and *Rossija* and does not bother to suggest that there might be problems of reference. Examples are taken indiscriminately from various centuries; thus Alekseev ("Почему", 5–10) presents, on an absolutely equal footing, citations from the *Stoglav* (16th c.), a text of c1165 in a 13th-c. copy, a gramota of 1392, citations from the Повесть временных лет s.a. 1071 (in the 1377 copy), Ludolf (1696), to mention only the most egregious instances. The imperial premise leads also to disregard of region, a methodological fault that is particularly frequent when 15th–17th century texts are discussed. For example, Uspenskij (64) cites the Ukrainian Ivan Vyšens'kyj, who is discussing questions of dealing with vernacular Ukrainian and the local varieties of Slavonic c1610, as though the problems are identical with those of Rusian stylistics before 1400. Uspenskij, Alekseev, and many other contemporary Soviet Russians use the terms "древнерусский" or even "русский," in instances when, for linguistic as well as geographical reasons, "староукраинский" or "среднеукраинский"—or even the old vague term "западнорусский"—would be more appropriate. This imprecision in distinguishing temporal and regional data inevitably leads to confusion because scholars jumble elements of one system incoherently with elements of other systems.

21 Most reviews (including the sort of warnings expressed in Vinogradov's introduction to Jakubinskij) are not allowed enough space for thorough discussion and a close examination of details; therefore they can provide only samples. (This stricture applies to my own comments in the works that are listed at the end of this paper.) Many reviewers feel compelled to offer only praise, but surely readers wish to know also about the deficiencies of the works under review. How can one express in gracious terms that an author's work is sloppy or incomplete or inconsistent or simply factually incorrect? Unfortunately, the critic who points out such faults is likely to find himself/herself accused of *ad hominem* attacks.

22 Certain other specific instances are to be found in my general 1988 paper ("Language"), and there are some examples in Thomson, "Contribution."

23 These remarks are repeated from my response to other textbooks, see "On Writing the History," devoted largely to Issatschenko's 1980 *Geschichte der russischen Sprache.* Uspenskij was strongly influenced by Issatschenko's presentation and—in my opinion, unfortunately—took over some of his idiosyncratic ideas.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

24 Vinogradov in 1958 set an agenda for research that has yet to be followed. Historians of Russian would do well to go back through his suggestions point by point and set about answering the questions he raises—not just by prolix essays about what might be done, but by pragmatic, principled marshalling of all available evidence.

25 Though the etymology is not unassailable, ерунда seems to have appeared first in seminarians' slang, *i.e.*, precisely among students required to learn Slavonic.

26 Alekseev ("Почему") objects to the term *diglossia*, citing the proliferation of definitions in world linguistic literature. Klimenko rambles on about varying percentages of heterogeneous lexical elements in early and modern Russian. Kolesov speaks of excessive abstraction in Uspenskij's views, without providing any clear alternatives. Rusinov worries about all sorts of definitions, earnestly quoting scholars of the past for the True Interpretation. Gorškov provides another long list of quotations to show that good old native scholars are preferable to the foreigners Uspenskij is alleged to prefer. The definitions and redefinitions, citations and counter-citations, lead nowhere.

27 In contrast, the chief methodological merit of Issatschenko's book is that he provides annotated sample texts of various periods and kinds of writing. Unfortunately, the notes are often dubious or incorrect.

28 Uspenskij's whole approach depends too much, in my opinion, on his multiplicity of primary and secondary either/or units (such as Russian/ChSl, religious/secular). It is true that many dichotomies serve as excellent heuristic tools and yield significant results. However, some central choices are Procrustean and can profitably be broken down further, *e.g., neutral* versus *marked* Slavonic as opposed to *neutral* versus *marked* Rusian. Most speech and writing is indeed neutral, with marked elements as highlights here and there.

29 Many Macedonians were literate in Serbian or Bulgarian or both (not to mention French, German, Russian, and other languages), but it was their aim to have their own individual standard. Their discussions about just how to work out the problems were of course based on experience and theories that have nothing to do with the situation of the Rus' c1037. The parallel I am suggesting is that the Rus' were adapting to their own use a written language that was only partly foreign, as in 1940 Serbian and Bulgarian were only partly foreign to Macedonian intellectuals.

30 My observations in Struga, Ohrid, and Skopje in 1951, 1952, and 1954 were immeasurably enhanced by the expert help of such perceptive natives as Blaže Koneski and Božo Vidoeski. Further observations in 1981 in Skopje showed greater use of speech very close to standard Macedonian, itself a compromise amalgam of several supradialects.

31 I have attempted to do just that in my article "On the Relationship"; for a similar analysis of the controversial *Kiev Folia*, see my "Once Again."

32 This conclusion was reached by N. S. Trubetzkoy in 1927 (in a pamphlet that was contraband in the USSR) and affirmed by N. N. Durnovo in articles that remained tabu until well after 1950; N. I. Tolstoj felt it necessary to summarize Trubetzkoy's reasoning in a 1981 article of limited circulation, now fortunately reprinted, 1988, 220–36. Trubetzkoy's essay was published in English at Columbia in 1949 (revised reprint 1952).

33 On one such variable, *torot/trat, cf.* my "Ling. Problems" 1985. Hüttl-Folter's book provides an exemplary data base of a type Soviet scholars rarely produce. She provides the full evidence that allows us to disagree in principled ways with her analysis and conclusions.

34 For more details, including a series of specific remarks about the books under review here, see my "Language of Rus' in the Eleventh Century" 1988. Appendix 4 of that work attempts to formulate contrasting views in terms of specific assumptions and hypotheses, in an effort to focus the discussion; somehow this sort of explicit discussion of clearly defined theses seems to be particularly foreign to Soviet scholarship.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

35 Precisely how one determines just what is "Slavonic" and what is "vernacular" is apparently a matter of native instinct; when Uspenskij or Alekseev declares that a word or phrase betrays "живой язык," I wish to ask, "How does he know?"

36 Evaluation of this sort of nuance is difficult if one is not a participant in the culture. In early Rusian въ своѥ си 'homeward, to one's own place' was surely a "Slavonicism" derived from OCS books. (In fact in OCS itself it is doubtless a Hellenism, calqued from εἰς τὰ ἴδια.) What was its stylistic value? Does "Slavonic" inevitably mean "religious" or "elevated"? Whatever answer we may give to this questions about the early period, the восвояси that occurs in a modern translation of the Life of Feodosij (Tvorogov, 105), as an equivalent of въ градъ свои, lends a homey colloquial touch to the sentence, I have been assured by sophisticated native speakers of Russian. The original phrase was, surely, neutral; в свой город would be an appropriate modern neutral equivalent, or perhaps simply домой.

37 In part, this sort of problem arises because this work was written for a very specific Moscow University course within a specific pedagogical framework. A brief preface that specified this fact and just what materials are *not* covered should have been added on publication outside the Soviet Union. The date the manuscript was completed is also unclear; on the whole it appears to be several years old, despite a few recent references.

38 The prescriptions of Smotrickij's Slavonic grammatical writings have a very different value in his homeland—where there were many-faceted struggles between Orthodox and Catholic faiths; Polish, Lithuanian, and Slavic ethnic traditions; and several vernaculars and written linguistic traditions—and in Muscovy. Smotrickij himself published works in Polish and quasi-vernacular Ukrainian as well as Slavonic.

39 He goes so far as to posit a "церковнославянско-греч. двуязычие" (32) in educated circles in the earliest period.

40 The notion that anything "Russian" could possibly be "low" deeply offends hyperpatriots like Rusinov (47–8), who goes so far as to accuse Uspenskij of the heresy of the треязычники who plagued Constantine and Methodius, *i.e.*, a doctrinal deviation.

41 For Uspenskij, the entire complex array of verbal forms present in early Rus′ texts but absent after 1700 was artificial, somehow borrowed from OCS.

42 Francis Thomson, after a thorough review of all texts that can be assigned to the early period, finds that only Ilarian's *Sermon on Law and Grace* reveals a knowledge of Greek works other than those demonstrably translated into OCS before c1000, see his "Quotations," "Implications," and "Bulgarian Contributions." *Pace* Alekseev "К истории" (189–90), neither he nor anyone else has provided plausible evidence for Rusian translations that undermines Thomson's conclusions. The presence in Rusian hymnological manuscripts of Greek hymns or phrases (always in Cyrillic transcription) in no way affirms, *pace* Uspenskij, that the Rus′ who sang from such manuscripts understood the non-Slavic words.

43 Just how the books arrived and who brought them from where remains an enigma that may well never be solved, *cf.* Thomson "Contribution." Their presence in 11th–c. Rus′, however, must be regarded as fact.

44 The statement (30) "Именно потому, что рус. культура сразу вписалась в византийскую, здесь не было периода ученичества," along with the discussion in which it is embedded (to p. 40), is thoroughly misleading; even the first steps in original composition, the PVL and hagiographic works about Boris and Gleb and Feodosij Pečerskij at the turn of the 11th–12th c., are still the work of apprentices. To characterize Nestor as an apprentice and to insist on the presence of linguistic and structural clumsinesses in his life of Feodosij does not deny Børtnes's view that the work "is an outstanding monument of this age" (87) or that it was influential, popular, and aesthetically valuable (49).

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

45 Obviously one also assumes that they had learned enough to feel a need for writing messages of various sorts. The form and organization of their more complex writings of course would be influenced by whatever models they were exposed to—surely the OCS books.

46 The major features of this norm have long been known, but often scholars fail to specify details. I attempt to do so in my 1987 "Relationship" (*cf.* also the appendices to 1988 "Languages").

47 See appendix. Uspenskij remarks correctly that the vocative was lost in Great-Russian dialects (143), then immediately claims that the process was reflected in 1056–57. But the Ostromir Gospel (*pace* Uspenskij, 136, surely a Kievan product) is not a Great-Russian text, and the vocative still exists in standard Ukrainian. His sole example is in fact OCS (Luke 10:41, in three of the four OCS gospel manuscripts), the form Марта being an exclamatory nominative rather than vocative (which is in the OCS codex Assemanianus). Since the form is fully compatible with such modern systems as Czech, methodologically we are justified in interpreting it as effective vernacular Slavic and seeing it as skillful translation. A fallback position would be to call it a Hellenism; in any case it tells us nothing specific about East Slavic of the 1050s.

48 Uspenskij's account of тебѣ себѣ versus тобѣ собѣ (139) is almost meaningless and will not prepare students for the usages found in the real manuscripts. (Perhaps here too he relies on the content of another course that is taken for granted?) He does not mention the innovative accusatives меня тебя себя, although Gadolina treats them efficiently in an excellent article that provides the detailed information scholars and students need to know.

49 An example: Uspenskij holds (55–6) that the audience for Ilarion's *Sermon on Law and Grace* was necessarily well educated, for understanding requires both a knowledge of Galatians, Genesis, "and also the tradition of exegesis of these texts." Not at all! The lection from Galatians (4:22–5:1) is read on a major Marian feast, the Birth of the Theotokos, Sept. 8, and any adult church-goer would surely have gotten the basic message long before Ilarion belabored it: *Hagar = slave = old = 'they'* versus *Sarah = free = new = 'we'*. One can agree that Ilarion wrote with skill and played individual variations on the theme; this, however, in no way means that he expected his audience to savor every detail. More generally. Uspenskij believes that the Rus' must have understood the poetic subtleties of the bad Slavonic translations of intricate Byzantine hymns; I hold rather that the singing or recitation of such works was simply a ritual that involved only a general grasp of a few basic images; the activity of repetition was sufficient for the worshipper as a sign of piety.

50 An example is the proposed dichotomy Vladimir=книжное учение versus Jaroslav= книжное просвщение. First, "illumination" is attributed to Volodimir, both s.a. 1037 (Lav, 152.9), and 988 (121.5) although the noun is not used anywhere in the PVL. Second, no books were distributed by Volodimir (*pace* Uspenskij's statements at the bottom of 22 and the top of 30): the text reads Симъ же раздаяномъ на учение книгамъ, *i.e.*, with a masculine dative absolute where "they" can refer only to the children of the nobility from the previous passage, hence "When they had been distributed for the purpose of studying the books" (in Lixačev's translation, на учение книжное). However, the 1037 eulogy has a broader perspective and offers a three-stage metaphor, with [1] Volodimir as the farmer who softened and plowed the earth (землю взора и умѧѵи, рекше крщеньемь просвѣтивъ (Lav, 152), while [2] Jaroslav sowed the seed by planting книжные словеса in the hearts of believers, so that [3] "мы"—presumably Nestor and his generation in the 1070s—пожинаемъ, оуѵенье приемлюще книжное, 'we reap, obtaining book-learning'. The equation of 'baptism' and 'illumination' is hardly original, but the point here is that baptism and booklearning seem to be explicitly separated by the half-century from 988 to 1037, while reaping the fruits comes still a generation later. It seems to me that this does not support Uspenskij's thesis.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

51 Otherwise, Roždestvenskaja offers a competent bibliographical survey, but her own interpretations are strictly in accord with old dogmas. Dmitrenko, Iordanidi, and Vladimirova are depressingly unprofessional, and raise the problem as to how articles are screened for publication in this sort of supposedly authoritative volume. Barankova's generally intelligent remarks betray the parochial, Russian-only attitude that so hampers progress; she is unaware of Aitzetmüller's monumental work and the studies that have followed.

52 The field of historical accentology is a beacon of creative and original research, embodied particularly in many studies by V. A. Dybo and Zaliznjak's magisterial summation in a book whose only fault is that it had to be compressed into a space that was inadequate for the complicated materials that needed to be presented.

53 Uspenskij's account of all this (126) is off the mark (quite apart from his premise that aorists were purely artificial for East Slavs to start with) because he mixes different classes of verbs and jumps from 1100 to 1619 far too quickly. In the twelfth-century Uspenskij Sbornik, forms with -тъ constitute about 53.5% of occurrences, and the zero-desinence 45.7%; начать is found once in the Life of Feodosij and приѧть once in an originally OCS work, while начатыи < -тъ plus the enclitic pronoun и occurs in a work on Boris and Gleb.

54 Comparative evidence allows us to define these roots as accentually *unmarked* or, in older terminology, "circumflex," *cf.* Lunt *Gram* §10.52 with note.

55 Vaillant, *Manuel* §154 explicitly separates бити from the пити class.

56 "Simplified" presentations such as Gorškov's OCS handbook or LeGuillou's Old Russian grammar (*cf.* my review) simply omit the aorists with -тъ.

57 Some of the serious flaws in this volume are noted by Marti. The work of the individual authors of chapters, in this case Valerij Vasil'evič Ivanov, seems not to have profitted by the expertise of the nominal editor, Avanesov.

58 The date is a guess; it is unfortunate that even for many changes in much more significant features of morphology no reasonably precise chronology has yet been established.

59 Although Ivanov's chapter has deficiencies of the sort just cited, it is up-to-date in many other respects. Thus, his summary account of the restructuring of the present of *da(d)*- makes good use of Sorokina's careful analyses to show the complex development, дамь/дам, даси/дашь, дасть, дамъ (дамы)/дадим, дасте/дадите, дадѧть/дадут. Too few reliable and detailed studies of this sort have appeared. (Uspenskij says nothing about any of these questions, perhaps assuming knowledge from a different course.)

60 A complication is that after c1150 *ky gy xy* changed to *ki gi xi*, although scribes long held to old spellings with ы.

61 Let me emphasize that Sobolevskij (1907) is the fundamental source for nearly all authors since that time, and it was for that period an excellent work. The 1219 example is a clause from a sentence that may have been garbled in the original OCS translation; in any case it cannot be cited as anything but bad syntax. Durnovo's selection from Sobolevskij's documentation generally is judicious and his own modifications are usually reliable; the 1092 citation is one of the instances where I disagree for reasons I believe might well have been acceptable to him.

62 Radz in PSRL 1.42.20–21; Hyp in PSRL 2.32, Ham. in Istrin, 547.

63 Karskij's apparatus to Lav (PSRL 1) fails to note these details.

WORKS CITED

Aitzetmüller, Rudolf. *Das Hexaemeron des Exarch Ioan.* I–VII. Graz, 1958–75.

Alekseev, Anatolij A. "Почему в Древней Руси не было диглоссии," 3–11 in Kolesov 1986.

_____. "К истории переводческой школы XII в.," *ТОДРЛ* 41 (1988):154–95.

Avanesov, R. I., ed. *Историческая грамматика русского языка: Морфология, Глагол.* Moscow, 1982.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Barankova, G. S. "Ранняя русская редакция 'Шестоднева' Иоанна экзарха Болгарского," 77–89 in Žukovskaja 1987.

Bernštejn, Samuil Borisovič. "Трагическая страница из истории славянской филологии (30-е годы XX века)," *Славянское славяноведение* 1989/1, 77–82.

Borkovskij, V. I., and P. S. Kuznecov. *Историческая грамматика русского языка*[2]. Moscow, 1965.

Børtnes, Jostein. *Visions of Glory.* Oslo, 1988.

Dimitrov, Dim. D. "Славянская филология на путях фашизации," *Труды института 'Язык и мышление'* 5(1935):125–33.

Dmitrenko, S. N. "Соотношение древнерусских и старославянских черт в двух памятниках древнерусского языка," 117–128 in Žukovskaja 1987.

Durnovo, N. N. *Очерк истории русского языка.* Moscow–Leningrad, 1924. [Reprint, The Hague, 1959.]

_____. "К вопросу о времени распада общеславянского языка," *Sborník práci I. Sjezdu slovanských filologů v Praze 1929*, 2.514–26. Prague, 1932.

Eckert, Rainer. "L. P. Jakubinskij's Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der sovietischen Sprachwissenschaft," *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 34 (1989):64–71.

Franklin, Simon. "Literacy and Documentation in Early Medieval Russia," *Speculum* 60(1985): 1–38.

_____. "The Writing in the Ground: Recent Soviet Publications on Early Russian Literacy," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 65(1987):412–421.

_____. "Book-Learning and Bookmen in Kievan Rus': A Survey of an Idea," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988–89):830–848.

Gadolina, M. A. "К истории некоторых форм личных и возвратного местоимений, *Труды института языкознания* 5 (1954):34–80.

Gorškov, A. I. *Старославянский язык.* Moscow, 1963.

_____. "Отечественные филологи о старославянском и древнерусском литературном языке," 7–29 in Žukovskaja 1987.

Hock, Wolfgang. *Das Nominalsystem im Uspenskij Sbornik* (=Sagners Slavistische Beiträge, 202). Munich, 1986.

Hüttl-Folter, Gerta. *Die* trat/torot-*Lexeme in den altrussischen Chroniken (*=Öster. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl., *Sitzungsber.*, 420 Bd.) Vienna, 1983.

Iordanidi, S. I. "Наблюдения над формами имен существительных в древнерусской письменности XI-XII вв.," 176–196 in Žukovskaja 1987.

Issatschenko, Alexander. *Geschichte der russischen Sprache.* Wiesbaden, 1980.

Istrin, A. I. *Хроника Георгия Амартола*, I. Petrograd, 1920.

Jakubinskij, L. P. *История древнерусского языка.* Moscow, 1953.

Klimenko, L. P. "История русского литературного языка с точки зрения теории диглосии," 11–22 in Kolesov 1986.

Kolesov, V. V., ed. *Литературный язык Древней Руси. (Проблемы исторического языкознания*, вып. 3). Leningrad, 1986.

Leskien, August. *Грамматика старославянского (древнеболгарского) языка.* Moscow, 1890.

L'Hermitte, René. *Marr, marrisme, marristes. Une page de la linguistique soviétique.* (Cultures et sociétés de l'Est, 8) Paris, 1987.

Lunt, Horace G. "The Language of Rus' in the Eleventh Century: Some Observations about Facts and Theories," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988–89):276–313.

_____. "Linguistic Problems in Old Rus'," *Slavic Review* 44 (1985):707–12.

_____. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*[6]. The Hague, 1974.

_____. "On Common Slavic." *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku*, 27–28. Novi Sad (1984–85):417–422.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

———. "On Dating Old Church Slavonic Gospel Manuscripts." In *South Slavic and Balkan Linguistics*, ed. A. A. Barentsen *et al.* (=*Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics,* 2), (Amsterdam, 1982), 215–32.

———. "On Editing Early Slavic Manuscripts: the Cases of the Codex Suprasliensis, the Mstislav Gospel, and the Banica Gospel," *IJSLP* 30 (1984):7–74.

———. "On Interpreting the Russian Primary Chronicle: The Entry for 1037," *SEEJ* 32 (1988):251–64.

———. "On the Language of Old Rus': Some Questions and Suggestions," *Russian Linguistics* 2 (1975):269–81.

———. "On the Relationship of Old Church Slavonic to the Written Language of Early Rus'," *Russian Linguistics* 11 (1987):133–62.

———. "On Writing the History of the Language of Old Rus." In *Semiotics and History of Culture. In honorem Georgii Lotman*, ed. M. Halle *et al.* (Michigan Slavic Publications: Ann Arbor MI, 1983), 303–319.

———. *The Orthography of Eleventh-Century Russian Manuscripts.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1950.

———. Review of J. Stalin, *Der Marxismus und Die Fragen der Sprachwissenschaft, Erasmus* 5 (1952):227–31.

———. Review of N. A. Kondrašov, *Славянские языки* (2nd ed. Moscow, 1963), *IJSLP* 9 (1965):176–7.

———. Review of G. Y. Shevelov, *A Prehistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic* (New York, 1965), *SEEJ* 10 (1966):85–92.

———. Review of S. I. Kotkov, ed., *Синайский патерик* (Moscow, 1967), *SEEJ* 13 (1969):255–7.

———. Review of N. G. Samsonov, *Drevnerusskij jazyk* (Moscow, 1973), *SEEJ* 19 (1975):361–3.

———. Review of Ilya Talev, *Some Problems of the Second South Slavic Influence in Russia* (Munich, 1973), *SEEJ* 17 (1973):488–91.

———. Review of J.-Y. LeGuillou, *Grammaire du vieux-russe* (Paris, 1972), *SEEJ* 33 (1974): 191–2.

———. Review of *Imennoe sklonenie v slavjanskix jazykax XI–XIV vv.* (Leningrad, 1974), *SEEJ* 19 (1975):469–71.

———. Review of S. G. Barxudarov *et al.*, eds., *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv.*: Vyp. 1, 2, and *Ukazatel' istočnikov* (Moscow, 1975), *Language* 52 (1976):709–17.

———. Review of *SRJa XI–XVII*, Vyp. 3 and 4 (1978), *Language* 55 (1979):920–924.

———. Review of S. I. Kotkov, ed., *Выголексинский сборник*, Moscow, 1977, *SEEJ* 23 (1979):551–2.

———. Review of *Izbornik Svjatoslava 1073 goda. Faksimil'noe izdanie.* [266 folios.] *Naučnyj apparat faksimil'nogo izdanija*, ed. B. A. Rybakov et al. (Moscow, 1983). *IJSLP* 28 (1984):164–66.

———. "Slavs, Common Slavic, and Old Church Slavonic." *Litterae Slavicae Medii Aevi*, ed. Johannes Reinhard (= Sagners Slavistische Sammlung, Bd. 8), 185–204. Munich, 1985.

———. "Once Again the *Kiev Folia*," *SEEJ* 32 (1988):593–616.

——— and Moshe Taube. "Early Slavic Translations from Hebrew?" *Russian Linguistics* 12 (1988):147–87.

Marti, Roland. Review of Avanesov. *Russian Linguistics* 8 (1984):59–72.

Maslov, Jurij S. "Имперфект глаголов совершенного вида в славянских языках," *Вопросы славянского языкознания* 1 (1954):68–138.

Nasonov, A. N. *Новгородксая первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов.* Moscow-Leningrad, 1950.

Nikolaev, S. L. "Следы особенностей восточнославянских племенных диалектов в современных великорусских говорах: I. Кривичи," in *Балтославянские исследования* 1986, 115–54. Moscow, 1988.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Robinson, A. N. "Славянские литературы среди средневековых литератур мира (старший период)," in *X международный съезд славистов* (Moscow, 1988), 3–19.

Ostrowski, Donald G. "Textual Criticism and the Text of the *Povest' vremennykh let*: Some Theoretical Considerations," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5 (1981):11–31.

Rožd̲estvenskaja, T. V. "Письменная традиция северной Руси по эпиграфическим данным," 36–45 in Žukovskaja 1987.

Rusinov, N. D. "Об устных нормах древнерусской литературной речи," 42–55 in Kolesov 1986.

Thomas, Lawrence L. "Some Notes on the Marr School," *The American Slavic and East European Review* 16 (1957):323–48.

Thomson, Francis J. "The Bulgarian Contribution to the Reception of Byzantine Culture in Kievan Rus'—the Myths and the Enigma." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988–89): 214–61.

_____. "The Implications of the Absence of Quotations of Untranslated Greek Works in Original Early Russian Literature Together with a Critique of a Distorted Picture of Early Bulgarian Culture," *Slavica Gandensia* 15 (1988):63–91.

_____. "Quotations of Patristic and Byzantine Works by Early Russian Authors as an Indication of the Cultural Level of Kievan Russia," *Slavica Gandensia* 10 (1983):65–101.

Seliščev, A. M. *Старославянский язык.* Moscow, 1951.

Sobolevskij, A. I. *Лекции по истории русского языка*[4]. Moscow, 1907.

Tolstoj, Nikita Il'ič. *История и структура славянских литературных языков.* Moscow, 1988.

Trubeckoj, N. S. *К проблеме русского самопознания.* Paris, 1927.

Trubetzkoy, N. S. *The Common Slavic Element in Russian Culture* (ed. Leon Stilman). Columbia University, Department of Slavic Languages: NY, 1952.

Tvorogov, O. V. [translation of Житие Феодосия печерского], in *«Изборник» (Сборник прозведений литературы древней Руси)*, ed. L. A. Dmitriev and D. S. Lixačev (Moscow, 1969).

Uspenskij, Boris Andreevič. *История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.)* (=Sagners slavistische Sammlung, Bd. 12). Munich, 1987.

Ustjugova, L. M. "Книжнославянизмы и соотносительные русизмы в основных списках 'Повести временных лет'," 90–104 in Žukovskaja 1987.

Vajan (= Vaillant), A. *Руководство по старославянскому языку.* Moscow, 1952.

Vaillant, André. *Manuel du vieux slave*[2]. Paris, 1964.

Vinogradov, Viktor V. "Проф. Л. П. Якубинский как лингвист и его 'История древнерусского языка'," in Jakubinskij 1953, 3–40.

_____. *Основные проблемы древнерусского литературного языка.* Moscow, 1958.

Vladimirova, L. A. "О некоторых языковых особенностях в Изборнике Святослава 1073 года," 62–67 in Žukovskaja 1987.

Vlasto, Alexis P. *A Linguistic History of Russian.* Oxford, 1986.

Worth, Dean S. "On 'Diglossia' in Medieval Russia," *Die Welt der Slaven* 23 (1978):371–93.

Xaburgaev, G. A. *Старославянский язык.* Moscow, 1974.

Zaliznjak, Andrej A. *От праславянской акцентуации к русской.* Moscow, 1985.

_____. "Новгородские берестяные грамоты с лингвистической точки зрения." In V. L. Janin and A. A. Zaliznjak, *Новгородские грамоты на бересте (из раскопок 1977-1983 гг.)* (Moscow, 1986), 89–219.

_____. "О языковой ситуации в древнем Новгороде." *Russian Linguistics* 11 (1987):115–32.

Živov, Viktor. "Еще раз о правописании ц и ѵ в древних новгородских рукописях." *Russian Linguistics* 10 (1986):291–306.

_____. "Проблемы формирования русской редакции церковнославянского языка на начальном этапе." *Вопросы языкознания* 1987/1:46–65.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Žukovskaja, Lidija P., "Грецизация и архаизация русского письма 2-й пол. XV-1 пол. XVI вв. (Об ошибочности понятия 'второе южнославянское влияние')," 144–76 in Žukovskaja 1987.

_____, ed. *Древнерусский литературный язык в его отношении к старославянскому.* Moscow, 1987.

This content downloaded from
192.110.202.74 on Fri, 10 Feb 2023 02:15:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms